



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_39461
Title of the Manuscript:	CORROSION BEHAVIOUR OF ALUMINIUM-IRON (Al-Fe) METAL MATRIX COMPOSITE (MMC) REINFORCED WITH SILICON CARBIDE (SiC) PARTICLES IN VARIOUS MEDIA CONCENTRATION OF TETRAOXIOSULPHATE IV ACID (H ₂ SO ₄)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Line 99: Tables 1, 2 & 3 and Figures 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 & 2.6 are all results and should be placed under Results and then discussed and Not under Procedure.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>The author(s) should equally include photographs or diagrams of equipment/materials and experimental set-up in the paper for clarity and to uphold the ethics of experimentation and research integrity. Diagrams are vital means of depicting scientific details.</p>	Noted
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 16: Micro structurally scan should read, Micro structural scan</p> <p>Lines 31 & 32: (Anyalebechi, Owate and Avwiri 2013, Koch, bronger, Thompson, Virmani and Payer 2002, ...), should read (Anyalebechi et al, 2013; Kosh et al, 2002, ...)</p> <p>Lines 35 & 36: (John F. Kennedy space center (KSC) TM-584C. Revision C 1994) should read John (1994)</p> <p>Line 57: (Anyalebechi <i>et.</i>, <i>al</i> 2013, Ihom, Nyior, Nor, Segun and Ogbodo 2012), should read (Anyalebechi <i>et al</i> 2013; Ihom, et al, 2012).</p> <p>Line 82: Weight loss instead of weight les</p>	
Optional/General comments	The paper is scientifically and technically sound, relevant and will thus contribute to knowledge.	